arXiv:0707.0731v3 [hep-ph] 8 Apr 2009

ITEP-LAT/2007-11

Z_6 symmetry of the Standard Model and Technicolor theory

M.A. Zubkov[a,b]

[a] *ITEP, B.Cheremushkinskaya 25, Moscow, 117259, Russia*

[b] *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, 141700, Dolgoprudnyi, Moscow Region, Russia*

Abstract

We consider the possibility to continue the Z_6 symmetry of the Standard Model to the Technicolor theories. Among the $SU(N)$ Weinberg - Susskind models and the $SU(N)$ Farhi - Susskind models for $N > 2$ only the $SU(4)$ Farhi - Susskind model may possess the mentioned symmetry. We also show that the hypercharge assignment of Minimal Walking $SU(2)$ Technicolor model may be chosen in such a way that the additional discrete symmetry is preserved.

1 Introduction

The Standard Model with the fundamental scalar Higgs field is known to have serious problems at the energies of the order of 1 Tev. From the point of view of perturbation theory this scale appears in the so-called Hierarchy problem [1]. Namely, the mass m^2 for the scalar field receives the quadratically divergent contribution in one loop. Therefore, formally the initial mass parameter ($m^2 = -\lambda v^2$, where v is the vacuum average of the scalar field while λ is its self - coupling) should be set to infinity in such a way that the renormalized mass m^2_R remains negative and finite. This is the content of the so-called fine tuning. It is commonly believed that this fine tuning is not natural [1] and, therefore, the finite ultraviolet cutoff Λ should be set up. From the requirement that the one-loop contribution to m^2 is less than $10|m^2_R|$ one derives that $\Lambda \sim 1$ TeV. This problem appears also in lattice nonperturbative study (see, for example, [2, 3]). Thus it is natural to construct the new theory, which describes Tev - scale physics and provides the spontaneous breakdown of Electroweak symmetry.

QCD is usually considered as the self consistent quantum field theory contrary to the Weinberg - Salam model. Therefore it is natural to construct the new Tev scale theory basing on the analogy with QCD. This program is realized in the so - called Technicolor theory[4, 5, 6]. Namely, the new Nonabelian gauge interaction is added with the scale $\Lambda_{TC} \sim 1$ Tev, where Λ_{TC} is the analogue of Λ_{QCD}. This new interaction is called Technicolor. The correspondent new fermions are called technifermions. The Electroweak gauge group acts on the technifermions. Therefore, breaking of the chiral symmetry in Technicolor theory causes Electroweak symmetry breaking. This makes three of the four Electroweak gauge bosons massive. However, pure Technicolor theory cannot explain appearance of fermion masses.

In order to make Standard Model fermions massive extra gauge interaction may be added, which is called Extended Technicolor (ETC) [4, 7]. In this new gauge theory the Standard Model fermions and technifermions enter the same representation of the Extended Technicolor group. Unfortunately, the first ETC models suffer from the extremely large flavor - changing amplitudes and unphysically large contribution to the Electroweak polarization operators [4]. The way to overcome these problems is related to the behavior of chiral gauge theories at large number of fermions or for the high order representations. Namely, the near conformal behavior of the Technicolor model allows to suppress dangerous flavor changing currents as well as to decrease the contribution to the S - parameter [8, 9]. (It is worth mentioning, however, that the generation of t - quark mass in these models still causes serious problems.)

There is a great number of Technicolor and Extended Technicolor models. That's why it is important to find a general principle, which may help to make a choice. The present paper is an attempt to extract such a principle from the additional Z_6 symmetry of the Standard Model. It has been found long time ago, that the spontaneous breakdown of $SU(5)$ symmetry in Grand Unified Theory actually leads to the gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)/Z_6$ instead of the conventional $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ (see, for example, [10] and references therein). However, the Z_6 symmetry is not the subject of the $SU(5)$ unification only. Actually, the Z_6 symmetry is present in the Standard Model itself without any relation to the particular Unified theory [11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. The Z_6 symmetry is rather restrictive and it forbids, for example, the appearance of such particles as left - handed Standard Model fermions with zero hypercharge. It was shown in [11], that the Unified models based on the Pati - Salam scheme may possess the Z_6 symmetry. Besides, it was found that in the so - called Petite Unification models (also based on the Pati-Salam scheme) the additional discrete symmetry is present (Z_2 or Z_3 depending on the choice of the model) [16].

Here we suggest the way to continue the mentioned Z_6 symmetry to Technicolor theories. Then we require that the Technicolor models possess this additional discrete symmetry and find, that this requirement gives an essential restriction on the choice of Technicolor theory. As it was shown in [16], the observability of the Z_6 symmetry of the Standard Model is related to the monopole content of the Unified theory. We do not need to know the details of the Unified model. The appearance of the additional Z_6 symmetry restricts essentially the monopole content of the Unified theory. In this paper we demonstrate that the same is valid for the theory that unifies Technicolor theory with the Standard Model. Usually the role of the Unified theory for Technicolor and Standard Model interactions is played by Extended Technicolor. Thus the additional discrete symmetry of the Technicolor should restrict the monopole content of Extended Technicolor.

The paper is organized as follows.

In section 2 we remind the reader the content of the additional Z_6 symmetry of the Standard Model.

In section 3 we suggest the way to continue the Z_6 symmetry of the Standard Model to its Technicolor extension.

In section 4 we consider the possibility to continue the given additional discrete symmetry to the minimal Technicolor model by Weinberg and Susskind.

In section 5 we consider in the same context Technicolor model by Farhi and Susskind.

In section 6 we consider the relation between the additional discrete symmetry of the Technicolor models and the monopole content of the Extended Technicolor models.

In section 7 we show that minimal walking Technicolor model may be constructed in such a way, that it preserves the additional Z_6 symmetry.

In section 8 we end with the conclusions.

$U\,e^{-i\theta}$	left-handed leptons
$e^{-2i\theta}$	right-handed leptons
$\Gamma\,U\,e^{\frac{i}{3}\theta}$	left-handed quarks
$\Gamma\,e^{-\frac{2i}{3}\theta}$	right-handed d, s, and, b - quarks
$\Gamma\,e^{\frac{4i}{3}\theta}$	right-handed u, c, and, t - quarks
$U\,e^{i\theta}$	the Higgs scalar field

2 Z_6 symmetry

Here we remind the reader of what we call the additional Z_6 symmetry in the Standard Model.

For any path $\mathcal{C}$, we may calculate the elementary parallel transporters

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma &= \mathrm{P}\exp(i\int_{\mathcal{C}} C^{\mu}dx^{\mu}) \\
U &= \mathrm{P}\exp(i\int_{\mathcal{C}} A^{\mu}dx^{\mu}) \\
e^{i\theta} &= \exp(i\int_{\mathcal{C}} B^{\mu}dx^{\mu}), \qquad (1)
\end{aligned}$$

where C, A, and B are correspondingly $SU(3)$, $SU(2)$ and $U(1)$ gauge fields of the Standard Model.

The parallel transporter correspondent to each fermion of the Standard Model (or to the scalar Higgs) is the product of the elementary ones listed above. Therefore, the elementary parallel transporters are encountered in the theory only in the combinations listed in the table.

It can be easily seen [11] that *all* the listed combinations are invariant under the following Z_6 transformations:

$$\begin{aligned}
U &\to Ue^{i\pi N}, \\
\theta &\to \theta + \pi N, \\
\Gamma &\to \Gamma e^{(2\pi i/3)N}, \qquad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

where N is an arbitrary integer number. This symmetry allows to define the Standard Model with the gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)/\mathcal{Z}$ ($\mathcal{Z} = Z_6$, Z_3 or Z_2) instead of the usual $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$.

As it was mentioned in the introduction, the fact that the Standard Model may have the gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)/Z_6$ can be recognized during the consideration of the $SU(5)$ unified model [10]. The $SU(5)$ parallel transporter at low energies has the form

$$\Omega = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \Gamma^{+} e^{\frac{2i\theta}{3}} & 0 \\ 0 & U e^{-i\theta} \end{array} \right) \in SU(5), \qquad (3)$$

where Γ, U, and $e^{i\theta}$ are the elementary parallel transporters of the Standard Model. (3) is obviously invariant under (2), which means that the breakdown pattern is $SU(5) \to SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)/Z_6$, and not $SU(5) \to SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$.

On the level of perturbation expansion around flat vacuum the mentioned versions of the Standard Model are indistinguishable. In [16] it was shown that the situation is changed if one considers the Standard Model in space of nontrivial topology, or, to be embedded into the unified model with the simply connected gauge group. Then the monopole content of the unified theory is completely different for the mentioned versions of the Standard Model. Petite Unification Theory [17] gives an example of realistic theory, in which the unification of interactions occurs at the Tev scale. In this theory due to the additional discrete symmetry of the Standard Model the topologically stable monopoles may appear with the masses of the order of 10 Tev [16].

3 How to continue Z_6 symmetry to the Technicolor models

It is worth mentioning that the additional discrete symmetry is rather restrictive. Namely, for the Standard Model the requirement that the fermion parallel transporters are invariant under Z_6 gives the condition for the choice of the representations that are allowed for the Standard Model fermions. Say, the left - handed $SU(2)$ doublets with zero hypercharge are forbidden.

The nature of the given additional symmetry is related to the centers Z_3 and Z_2 of $SU(3)$ and $SU(2)$. This symmetry connects the centers of $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ subgroups of the gauge group. We suggest the following way to continue this symmetry to the Technicolor extension of the Standard Model.

We connect the center of the Technicolor group to the centers of $SU(3)$ and $SU(2)$. Let $SU(N_{TC})$ be the Technicolor group. Then the transformation

(2) is generalized to

$$\begin{array}{rcl} U & \to & U e^{i\pi N}, \\ \theta & \to & \theta + \pi N, \\ \Gamma & \to & \Gamma e^{(2\pi i/3)N}, \\ \Theta & \to & \Theta e^{(2\pi i/N_{TC})N}. \end{array} \tag{4}$$

Here Θ is the $SU(N_{TC})$ parallel transporter. The parallel transporters correspondent to the new fermions of the theory should be invariant under (4). It should be mentioned that the resulting symmetry is not the product of Z_6 and $Z_{N_{TC}}$.

4 Minimal Technicolor model of Weinberg and Susskind

We consider here the simplest Technicolor model by Weinberg and Susskind [5] (see also [4] and references therein). The model contains technifermions

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} T^a \\ B^a \end{array} \right)_L, \quad \left(\begin{array}{c} T^a \\ B^a \end{array} \right)_R. \tag{5}$$

The hypercharge assignment is $Y = 0$ for the left - handed technifermions and $Y = \pm 1$ for the right - handed ones. Index a corresponds to the Technicolor group $SU(N_{TC})$. The model has local $SU(2)_L$ gauge symmetry and global $SU(2)_R$ symmetry. Chiral symmetry breaking provides breakdown of Electroweak symmetry and formation of massive W and Z bosons. One can also consider $N_D \neq 1$ copies of technifermions.

Now we require that the parallel transporters correspondent to the technifermions are invariant under (4). This leads to the following condition:

$$\frac{2\pi N}{N_{TC}} + \pi N = 2\pi k(N),\, k(N) \in Z \tag{6}$$

The only solution of this equation is $N_{TC} = 2, k(N) = N$. Thus we conclude that the Technicolor model of Weinberg and Susskind is invariant under the extention of Z_6 symmetry of the Standard Model if the Technicolor group is $SU(2)$. The correspondent additional symmetry is Z_6. The given Technicolor Extention of the Standard model is, therefore, allowed to have the gauge group $SU(2) \otimes SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)/Z_6$ instead of $SU(2) \otimes SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$.

It is worth mentioning that the $SU(2)$ Technicolor interactions alone suffer from the vacuum alignment problems. In order to demonstrate this let us remind briefly the consideration of [21]. We define the field

$$Q^{\dot{\alpha},a} = \left(\begin{array}{c} T_L^{\dot{\alpha},a} \\ B_L^{\dot{\alpha},a} \\ \epsilon^{aa'}[T_R^{\alpha,a'}]^* \\ \epsilon^{aa'}[B_R^{\alpha,a'}]^* \end{array} \right) \tag{7}$$

(Here $\alpha, \beta, \dot{\alpha}, \dot{\beta}$ are spinor indices. The conventional four component spinor T is composed of the two component spinors as $T = (T^1_R, T^2_R, \epsilon_{1\alpha}T^{\dot{\alpha}}_L, \epsilon_{2\alpha}T^{\dot{\alpha}}_L)^T$.)

$Q^{\dot{\alpha},a}$ transforms as a left - handed dotted spinor under $SL(2,C)$ and as an element of fundamental representation under Technicolor $SU(2)$. If the Electroweak interactions are switched off the Technicolor lagrangian is invariant under the global $SU(4)$ symmetry. The $SU(2)$ and $SL(2,C)$ invariant bilinear combination of Q is

$$\Phi_{AB} = \epsilon_{ab}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}Q^{\dot{\alpha},a}_A Q^{\dot{\beta},b}_B, \tag{8}$$

where A, B are $SU(4)$ indices.

The low energy effective potential $V(\Phi)$ is invariant under the action of $SU(4)$ on Φ. The correct vacuum value of Φ is chosen when the $SU(4)$ breaking perturbations are taken into account. This process is known as vacuum alignment [21].

The conventional Electroweak vacuum corresponds to the value of Φ proportional to

$$\Phi = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \tag{9}$$

The correspondent chiral condensate is $\langle \delta_{ab}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}[T^{\beta b}_R]^* T^{\dot{\alpha}a}_L + \delta_{ab}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}[B^{\beta b}_R]^* B^{\dot{\alpha}a}_L \rangle$.

However, the following value is also admitted

$$\Phi = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{array} \right) \tag{10}$$

In this case the condensate is $\langle \epsilon_{ab}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}T_L^{\dot{\alpha}a}B_L^{\dot{\beta}b} + \epsilon_{ab}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}[T_R^{\alpha a}]^+[B_R^{\beta b}]^+\rangle$ and the Electroweak $SU(2)$ remains unbroken while photon becomes massive.

In general the chiral symmetry breaking is a rather complicated phenomenon and its physics is still not understood in sufficient details. Therefore, it is not completely clear which one of the two mentioned possibilities is realized. The analysis of [21] shows that the small perturbations due to the Electroweak interactions choose such a vacuum that the Electroweak symmetry is broken in a minimal way, i.e. the sum of squared gauge boson masses is minimized. With this rule we come to the conclusion that in the $SU(2)$ Weinberg - Susskind model the second of the two possibilities mentioned above is realized and the Electroweak symmetry is broken incorrectly.

5 Farhi-Sasskind model

The model [6, 4] contains four doublets

$$\begin{array}{c} \left(\begin{array}{c} U_i^a \\ D_i^a \end{array}\right)_L, \quad \left(\begin{array}{c} U_i^a \\ D_i^a \end{array}\right)_R \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} N^a \\ E^a \end{array}\right)_L, \quad \left(\begin{array}{c} N^a \\ E^a \end{array}\right)_R. \end{array} \tag{11}$$

Here a is the Technicolor $SU(N_{TC})$ index while index i corresponds to the color group $SU(3)$. Colored fermions are called techniquarks, while the others are called technileptons. The hypercharge of the left - handed technileptons is denoted as Y_L. The hypercharges of the right - handed technileptons are denoted as $Y_R^{1,2}$. The hypercharge of the left - handed techniquarks is denoted as Y_L^c. The hypercharges of the right - handed techniquarks are denoted as $(Y^c)_R^{1,2}$. The conventional chiral condensates are invariant under the electromagnetic $U(1)$ transformations if $Y_R^{1,2} = Y_L \pm 1$, $(Y^c)_R^{1,2} = Y_L^c \pm 1$.

The theory is anomaly - free if $Y_L + 3Y_L^c = 0$. Let us now require that the model is invariant under the additional symmetry (4). Thus we must have

$$\begin{array}{l} [\frac{2}{N_{TC}} + \frac{2}{3} + 1 + Y_L^c] \,\mathrm{mod}\, 2 = 0 \\ [\frac{2}{N_{TC}} + 1 + Y_L] \,\mathrm{mod}\, 2 = 0 \\ Y_L + 3Y_L^c = 0 \end{array} \tag{12}$$

The given system of equations has the two sets of solutions:
1) $N_{TC} = 2, Y^c_L = -\frac{Y_L}{3}, Y_L = 2(1-3k), k \in Z$;
2) $N_{TC} = 4, Y^c_L = -\frac{Y_L}{3}, Y_L = \frac{1}{2} - 6k, k \in Z$.

Thus only groups $SU(2)$ and $SU(4)$ may serve as Technicolor groups of Farhi-Sasskind model if we require that the theory possesses the additional symmetry (4). The following groups may be the gauge groups of the correspondent extensions of the Standard Model:

$$SU(2) \otimes SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)/Z_6 \tag{13}$$

or

$$SU(4) \otimes SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)/Z_{12} \tag{14}$$

It was already mentioned that the $SU(2)$ Technicolor interactions in the Weinberg - Susskind model suffer from the vacuum alignment problems. In the same way in the $SU(2)$ Farhi - Susskind model such problems appear in the technilepton sector [21]. For this reason among the two models with Technicolor groups $SU(2)$ and $SU(4)$ that preserve an additional discrete symmetry the preferred Technicolor Farhi - Susskind model is the one with the $SU(4)$ group.

6 The unification of Technicolor and Standard Model interactions

In this section we demonstrate how, in principle, the Technicolor and the Standard Model interactions may be unified in a common gauge group. We do not discuss here the details of the breakdown mechanism and how the chiral anomaly cancellation is provided within the given scheme of Unification. Our aim here is to demonstrate how the additional discrete symmetry (4) may appear during the breakdown of Unified gauge symmetry.

For the definiteness let us consider $N_{TC} = 4$. Let $SU(10)$ be the Unified gauge group. The breakdown pattern is $SU(10) \to SU(4) \otimes SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)/Z_{12}$. We suppose that at low energies the $SU(10)$ parallel transporter has the form:

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta e^{-\frac{2i\theta}{4}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma^+ e^{\frac{2i\theta}{3}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & U e^{-i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{2i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \in SU(10), \tag{15}$$

The fermions of each generation $\Psi^{i_1...i_N}_{j_1...j_K}$ carry indices i_k of the fundamental representation of $SU(10)$ and the indices j_k of the conjugate representation. They may be identified with the Standard Model fermions and Farhi - Susskind fermions as follows (we consider here the first generation only):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Psi^{10} = e^c_R;\ \Psi^{10}_{10} = \nu_R;\ \Psi^{i_2} = \left(\begin{array}{c}\nu_L\\ e^-_L\end{array}\right);\\
&\Psi^{i_3} = d^c_{i_3,R};\ \Psi^{i_3}_{10} = u^c_{i_3,R};\ \Psi^{i_2}_{i_3} = \left(\begin{array}{c}u^{i_3}_L\\ d^{i_3}_L\end{array}\right);\\
&\Psi_{i_4} = E^c_{i_4,R};\ \Psi_{10,i_4} = N^c_{i_4,R};\ \Psi^{i_2 i_4} = \left(\begin{array}{c}N^{i_4}_L\\ E^{i_4}_L\end{array}\right);\\
&\Psi^{i_3}_{i_4} = D^c_{i_3 i_4,R};\ \Psi^{i_3}_{10,i_4} = U^c_{i_3 i_4,R};\ \Psi^{i_2 i_4}_{i_3} = \left(\begin{array}{c}U^{i_3 i_4}_L\\ D^{i_3 i_4}_L\end{array}\right)\\
&(i_2 = 8,9;\ i_3 = 5,6,7;\ i_4 = 1,2,3,4); \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

Here the charge conjugation is defined as follows: $f^c_{\dot\alpha} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}[f^\beta]^*$.

In principle the fermion content of the Unified model should be chosen in such a way that the anomalies are cancelled. Moreover, some physics should be added in order to provide "unnecessary" fermions with the masses well above 1 Tev scale. Besides, one must construct the unambiguous theory in such a way that at low energies the parallel transporters indeed have the form (15). All these issues are to be the subject of an additional investigation. For now, however, let us suppose that this program is fulfilled. Then all parallel transporters in the theory are invariant under (4) in a natural way. The gauge group $SU(10)$ is simply connected. That's why the Unified theory should contain monopole - like topological objects. The similar situation was considered in [16], where the Unification of the Standard Model interactions was considered. In particular, monopole configurations with the usual magnetic flux 2π and hypercharge flux π must be present. (Electromagnetic field is expressed through the $SU(2)$ field A and the hypercharge field B as follows: $A_{\rm em} = 2B + 2\sin^2\theta_W(A_3 - B)$.) It is worth mentioning that the monopoles with the usual magnetic flux $4\pi\cos^2\theta_W$ are also present in this theory.

Let us now suppose that the Unified theory is constructed in such a way that the breakdown pattern is $G \to SU(4)\otimes SU(3)\times SU(2)\times U(1)$. We also suppose that the hypercharges of the fermions are rational numbers $\frac{P}{Q}$ with integer P and Q, where the maximal value of Q is 3. Then the monopole content of the Unified theory is essentially different. Namely, the minimal hypercharge flux is 6π while the usual magnetic flux[1] is $12\pi\cos^2\theta_W$.

Thus, there is an essential difference between the monopole contents of the Unified models in the two considered cases. Namely, in the presence of symmetry (4), the monopoles with magnetic flux proportional to 2π appear, while in the opposite case they do not appear.

The considered $SU(10)$ interactions may be included into the sequence of Extended Technicolor interactions. Then the $SU(10)$ gauge group plays a role in the fermion mass formation mechanism.

7 Minimal walking Technicolor

Technicolor models with their chiral symmetry breaking are able to provide breaking of Electroweak symmetry. But these models alone cannot provide fermions with realistic masses. Standard Model fermions become massive if they may be transformed into technifermions, say, with ejecting of the new massive gauge bosons. Then the quark and lepton masses are evaluated at one loop level as $m_{q,l} \sim \frac{N_{TC}\Lambda^3_{TC}}{\Lambda^2_{ETC}}$, where Λ_{TC} is the Technicolor scale while Λ_{ETC} is the scale of the new strong interaction called Extended Technicolor. (Spontaneous breakdown of Extended Technicolor symmetry gives rise to the mass of the new gauge bosons of the order of Λ_{ETC}.)

The number of fermions (arranged in the fundamental representation of the Technicolor group) for which the behavior of the model becomes conformal can be evaluated [8] as $N_f \sim 4N_{TC}$. In this case the effective charge becomes walking instead of running [18]. In the correspondent ETC theory the flavor changing processes may be suppressed, which allows to approach to the realistic description of the generation of the Standard Model fermion masses. It is worth mentioning, however, that the realistic top quark mass cannot be generated in this way without causing additional problems in the theory. That's why the top quark mass generation should be a subject of an additional efforts in ETC model - building (see, for example, [19]). In the Farhi-Susskind model conformal regime is approached for the number of technifermion generations N_D equal to $N_D = 2$ at $N_{TC} = 4$.

---

[1] If the maximal value of Q is $Q_{max} > 3$ then the magnetic flux of the monopole is $4Q_{max}\pi\cos^2\theta_W$.

If the technifermions are arranged in the fundamental representation of the walking Technicolor model, the perturbative contribution to S parameter still remains dangerously large [9]. One way to avoid this problem is to consider higher representations of Technicolor group. The minimal choice here is $N_{TC} = 2$ with the one generation of technifermions from the two - index symmetric representation of $SU(2)$. This minimal model contains technifermions symmetric in Technicolor $SU(2)$ indices a and b:

$$\begin{aligned} L^{a,b} = \begin{pmatrix} U^{a,b} \\ D^{a,b} \end{pmatrix}_L, \quad R^{a,b} = \begin{pmatrix} U^{a,b} \\ D^{a,b} \end{pmatrix}_R \\ \begin{pmatrix} N \\ E \end{pmatrix}_L, \quad \begin{pmatrix} N \\ E \end{pmatrix}_R. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Here extra generation of Standard Model leptons is added in order to cancel chiral anomaly. In this model the contribution to S - parameter is sufficiently smaller than for the model with technifermions from the fundamental representation [9].

The anomaly is absent if $3Y^c_L + Y_L = 0$, where Y^c_L is the hypercharge of the left-handed technileptons while Y_L is the hypercharge of the new left - handed leptons that are Technicolor singlets. It is important, that the given two - index representation of Technicolor $SU(2)$ group does not feel the center of $SU(2)$. Therefore, the parallel transporters correspondent to the new fermions are invariant under (4) with $N_{TC} = 2$ if

$$\begin{aligned} &[1 + Y^c_L]\mathrm{mod}2 = 0 \\ &[1 + Y_L]\mathrm{mod}2 = 0 \\ &Y_L + 3Y^c_L = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The solution is $Y^c_L = -\frac{Y_L}{3}, Y_L = 3(1 - 2k), k \in Z$. Thus we conclude, that the minimal walking Technicolor model can be made invariant under the extension of the Z_6 symmetry of the Standard Model.

Let us also notice here that in the given model the vacuum average $\langle \epsilon_{cd}\epsilon_{ab}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} U_L^{a,c,\dot{\alpha}} D_L^{b,d,\dot{\beta}} + \epsilon_{cd}\epsilon_{ab}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}[U_R^{a,c,\alpha}]^+[D_R^{b,d,\beta}]^+\rangle$ may appear instead of the conventional $\langle \epsilon_{cd}\epsilon_{ab}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}[U_L^{a,c,\dot{\alpha}}]^+ U_R^{b,d,\beta} + \epsilon_{cd}\epsilon_{ab}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}[D_L^{a,c,\dot{\alpha}}]^+ D_R^{b,d,\beta}\rangle$. If so, the Electroweak symmetry would not be broken properly. However, it can be shown [21], that in this case the sum of squared gauge boson masses is larger, than for the conventional breakdown. That's why the preferred vacuum orientation in this case is the conventional one.

8 Conclusions

In this paper we suggest the way to continue the Z_6 symmetry of the Standard Model to the Technicolor theory.

We have found that the minimal Technicolor model of Weinberg and Susskind may possess the suggested additional discrete symmetry only for $N_{TC} = 2$. In the Farhi - Susskind model there are two possibilities: $N_{TC} = 2$ and $N_{TC} = 4$, for which the theory contains the additional discrete symmetry (correspondingly, Z_6 and Z_{12}). In the latter case the complete theory can be constructed with the gauge group $SU(4) \times SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)/Z_{12}$. It is worth mentioning that the $SU(2)$ Weinberg - Susskind and Farhi - Susskind models suffer from the vacuum alignment problems. That's why we do not consider them as realistic and the only possibility remains that is the $SU(4)$ Farhi - Susskind model. Our investigation of the $SU(2)$ minimal walking Technicolor model shows, that the hypercharge assignment can be chosen in such a way that the theory possesses an additional Z_6 symmetry.

We also have considered a possible Unification of Technicolor and Standard Model interactions. It is shown that there is a strong relation between the monopole content of the Unified Model and the appearance of the additional discrete symmetry in the Technicolor theory. Namely, the topologically stable monopoles with the magnetic flux 2π cannot appear if the additional discrete symmetry is absent. Thus if the appearance of such monopoles is recognized as necessary, then the imposing of the additional discrete symmetry on Technicolor is preferred.

Let us remind here that the additional discrete symmetry is rather restrictive. For the Standard Model the requirement that the fermion parallel transporters are invariant under Z_6 provides the important condition for the choice of the representations, in which the Standard Model fermions may be arranged. So, if the Technicolor model must necessarily preserve the additional discrete symmetry, we would have an important restriction on the choice of the Technicolor gauge group. The minimal walking Technicolor model and the $SU(4)$ Farhi - Susskind model satisfy this condition[2].

This work was partly supported by RFBR grants 05-02-16306, 07-02-00237, 08-02-00661, and 09-02-00338.

---

[2] Actually, due to the well - known problems in ETC model building we also do not exclude that the Technicolor theory, which gives rise to the Electroweak symmetry breaking may be supplemented with the mechanism of fermion mass generation different from that of ETC.

References

[1] J.A. Casas, J.R. Espinosa, I. Hidalgo, hep-ph/0607279

F. del Aguila, R. Pittau, Acta Phys.Polon. B35 (2004) 2767-2780

[2] B.L.G. Bakker, A.I. Veselov, and M.A. Zubkov, arXiv:0707.1017

[3] A.I.Veselov, M.A.Zubkov, JHEP 0812:109,2008

[4] Christopher T. Hill, Elizabeth H. Simmons, Phys.Rept. 381 (2003) 235-402; Erratum-ibid. 390 (2004) 553-554

Kenneth Lane, hep-ph/0202255

R. Sekhar Chivukula, hep-ph/0011264

[5] S.Weinberg, Phys.Rev.D 13, 974, 1976

L.Susskind, Phys.Rev.D 20, 2619, 1979

[6] E.Farhi, L.Susskind, Phys.Rev.D 20, 3404, 1979

[7] Thomas Appelquist, Neil Christensen, Maurizio Piai, Robert Shrock, Phys.Rev. D70 (2004) 093010

Adam Martin, Kenneth Lane, Phys.Rev. D71 (2005) 015011

Thomas Appelquist, Maurizio Piai, Robert Shrock, Phys.Rev. D69 (2004) 015002

Robert Shrock, hep-ph/0703050

Adam Martin, Kenneth Lane, Phys.Rev. D71 (2005) 015011

[8] Thomas Appelquist, John Terning, L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Phys.Rev.Lett. 79 (1997) 2767-2770

Neil D. Christensen, Robert Shrock, Phys.Rev. D72 (2005) 035013

Masafumi Kurachi, Robert Shrock, Koichi Yamawaki, hep-ph/0704.3481

T. Appelquist, F. Sannino, Phys.Rev. D59 (1999) 067702

T. Appelquist, P.S. Rodrigues da Silva, F. Sannino, Phys.Rev. D60 (1999) 116007

[9] R. Foadi, M.T. Frandsen, T. A. Ryttov, F. Sannino, arXiv:0706.1696

Sven Bjarke Gudnason, Chris Kouvaris, Francesco Sannino, Phys.Rev. D73 (2006) 115003

D.D. Dietrich (NBI), F. Sannino (NBI), K. Tuominen, Phys.Rev. D72 (2005) 055001

[10] C.Gardner, J.Harvey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** (1984) 879

Tanmay Vachaspati, Phys.Rev.Lett. 76 (1996) 188-191

Hong Liu, Tanmay Vachaspati, Phys.Rev. D56 (1997) 1300-1312

[11] B.L.G. Bakker, A.I. Veselov, and M.A. Zubkov, Phys. Lett. B **583**, 379 (2004);

[12] B.L.G. Bakker, A.I. Veselov, and M.A. Zubkov, Yad. Fiz. **68**, 1045 (2005).

[13] B.L.G. Bakker, A.I. Veselov, and M.A. Zubkov, Phys. Lett. B **620** (2005) 156-163.

[14] B.L.G. Bakker, A.I. Veselov, and M.A. Zubkov, Phys.Lett. B642 (2006) 147-152

[15] K.S. Babu, I. Gogoladze, and K. Wang, Phys. Lett. B **570**, 32 (2003); K.S. Babu, I. Gogoladze, and K. Wang, Nucl. Phys. B **660**, 322 (2003);

[16] M.A. Zubkov, Phys. Lett. B **649**, 91 (2007) , Erratum-ibid.B655:91,2007.

[17] Andrzej J. Buras, P.Q. Hung, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 035015 (2003).

Andrzej J. Buras, P.Q. Hung, Ngoc-Khanh Tran, Anton Poschenrieder, and Elmar Wyszomirski, Nucl.Phys. B **699**, 253 (2004);

Mehrdad Adibzadeh and P.Q. Hung, hep-ph/0705.1154.

[18] Thomas Appelquist, John Terning, L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Phys.Rev.Lett. 77 (1996) 1214-1217

Thomas Appelquist, Anuradha Ratnaweera, John Terning, L. C. R. Wijewardhana, Phys.Rev. D58 (1998) 105017

[19] F. Sannino, arXiv:0804.0182

N. Evans and F. Sannino, arXiv:hep-ph/0512080.

[20] Thomas Appelquist, Maurizio Piai, Robert Shrock, Phys.Rev. D69 (2004) 015002

Thomas Appelquist, Robert Shrock, Phys.Lett. B548 (2002) 204-214

[21] J. Preskill, Nucl. Phys. B177, 21 (1981); M. E. Peskin, Nucl. Phys. B175, 197 (1980)